

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview held on November 17, 2005 and for indicating that claim 1 appears to be allowable.

Claims 1-20 are pending. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,485,370 to Moss et al. (hereafter Moss) in view of Mallett “Service Control Manager” (hereafter Mallett). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Moss is directed to a system and method that provide communication between a user-friendly terminal and a number of service provider computers such as financial institutions. Mallett provides a general overview and comments regarding HP’s Service Control Manager that provides role-based system management services. However, Mallett’s general description does not mention an “all or none” model.

Contrary to Moss and Mallett, claim 1 recites: “wherein the user is authorized to run the requested tool only if the user is assigned with the role containing the requested tool on all of the nodes,” (emphasis added). As discussed during the Interview, the Office Action fails to address this specific feature. This “all or none” authorization model is described, for example, on page 7, lines 20-23 of the present application. As noted above, Moss and Mallett, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest this feature. Since the references do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 9, for at least the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Moss and Mallett, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “the user is authorized to run a requested tool if the user is assigned with one or more of the enabled roles associated with the requested tool on all of the target nodes,” as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 9 is allowable.

Claims 10-12 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 9 and for the additional features they recite.

Appl. No. 09/800,188
Amdt. dated December 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

With respect to claim 13, for at least the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Moss and Mallett, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “the user is authorized to run a requested tool if the user is assigned with one of the roles associated with the requested tool on all of the target nodes,” as recited in claim 13 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 13 is allowable.

Claims 14-20 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 13 and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 6, 2005



Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739